

REMARKS

Initially, in the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claims 1 – 5, 9 – 18, 20 – 25, 27 – 32 and 34 – 40 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 7,149,982 (Duperrouzel et al.) in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,157,381 (Bates et al.) and further in view of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2006/.004763 (Horvitz et al.). Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 34 and 35-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al.

Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of an article “More Usable Forms-Controlling Scroll Position” (Symonds). Claims 6 and 7 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Bates et al., Horvitz et al. and Symonds. Claims 12, 22, 28 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al. and Symonds. Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Bates et al. and Horvitz et al. Claim 33 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al. and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,506,951 (Ishikawa).

By the present response, Applicant has canceled claims 3, 6, 14, 24 and 28 without disclaimer. Further, Applicant has amended claims 1, 7, 10, 12, 15, 16, 20, 22, 23, 25, 30 and 36 to further clarify the invention. Claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 – 13, 15 – 18, 20 – 23, 25, 27 and 29 – 40 remain pending in the present application.

35 U.S.C. §103 Rejections

Claims 1 – 5, 9 – 18, 20 – 25, 27 – 32 and 34 – 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Bates et al. and Horvitz et al. Applicant has discussed the deficiencies of these references in Applicant’s previously filed response and reasserts all arguments submitted in that

response. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections and provides the following additional remarks.

Regarding claims 1, 10, 15, 20, 25, 30 and 36, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, using a java script to listen for an event triggered in response to a browser unloading the web user interface, or wherein in response to the operation of the set scroll position function setting a vertical scroll position a horizontal scroll position is automatically set and in response to the set scroll position function setting a horizontal scroll position the vertical scroll position is automatically set.

The Examiner admits that neither Duperrouzel, Bates nor Horvitz discloses or suggests using a java script to listen for an event triggered in response to a browser unloading the web user interface, but asserts that Symonds discloses these limitations (although the Examiner provides no specific portion of Symonds). However, Symonds merely discloses maintaining a page's scroll position when a form page posts back to itself that includes writing some java script to grab the current x and y scroll coordinates of the page and setting the scroll coordinates of the page once it reloads. This is not using a java script to listen for an event triggered in response to a browser unloading the web user interface, as recited in the claims of the present application. Symonds merely discloses generating a java script to grab the x and y scroll coordinates and then, once the page reloads setting the scroll coordinates. This is not listening for an event triggered in response to a browser unloading a web user interface.

Moreover, the Examiner asserts that Duperrouzel discloses setting the other of the vertical or horizontal scroll position in response to setting either the vertical or horizontal scroll position, at column 11, lines 44 – 54. However, these portions merely disclose that the snapshots menu and its pull down menu provide the user with the capability of saving specific web pages (e.g., their URL addresses) and the configuration settings (such as the locations of the horizontal scroll bar and the vertical scroll bar) for their corresponding display panes, and that this is analogous to the user “taking a picture” of the screen. This is not wherein in response to the operation of the

set scroll position function setting a vertical scroll position a horizontal scroll position being automatically set, as recited in the claims of the present application. Further, this is not in response to the set scroll position function setting a horizontal scroll position the vertical scroll position being automatically set.

Duperrouzel, et. al. merely discloses that the URL addresses and locations of horizontal scroll bar and vertical scroll bar for their corresponding display panes can be saved. Duperrouzel, et. al. does not disclose or suggest automatically setting a horizontal scroll position in response to a vertical scroll position being set or automatically setting a vertical scroll position in response to a horizontal scroll position being set.

Regarding claims 2, 4, 5, 9-13, 16-18, 20-23, 27 and 29, 31, 32, 34, 35 and 37-40, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 1, 15, 25, 30 and 36 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 1-5, 9-18, 20-25, 27-32 and 34-40 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 20, 21, 23-25, 30, 31, 34 and 35-39 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claims 10, 20, 25, 30 and 36, as noted previously, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of each of these claims of, *inter alia*, using a java script to listen for an event triggered in response to a browser unloading the web user interface, or wherein in response to the operation of the set scroll position function setting a vertical scroll position a horizontal scroll position is automatically set and in response to the set scroll position function setting a horizontal scroll position the vertical scroll position is automatically set. None

of the cited references disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 11, 13, 21, 23, 31, 34, 35 and 37-39, Applicant submits that these claims are dependent on one of independent claims 10, 20, 30 and 36 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 10, 11, 13, 20, 21, 23 and 25, 30, 31, 34 and 35-39 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 15-18 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Symonds. Applicant respectfully traverses these rejections.

Regarding claim 15, Applicant submits that none of the cited references disclose or suggest the limitations in the combination of this claim of, *inter alia*, wherein the set scroll data function comprises a java script to listen for an unload event and to translate the scroll position to the pair of scroll coordinates, or wherein in response to the operation of the set scroll position function setting a vertical scroll position a horizontal scroll position is automatically set and in response to the set scroll position function setting a horizontal scroll position the vertical scroll position is automatically set. As noted previously, none of the cited references disclose or suggest these limitations in the claims of the present application. The disclosure in Symonds of saving scroll coordinates in a page is not a java script to listen for an unload event and translate the scroll position to the pair of scroll coordinates, as recited in the claims of the present application.

Regarding claims 16-18, Applicant submits that these claims are dependant on independent claim 15 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 15-18 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 7 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Bates et al., Horvitz et al. and Symonds. Applicant submits that this claim is dependant on independent claim 1 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claims 6 and 7 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claims 12, 22 and 40 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al. and Symonds. Applicant submits that these claims are dependant on one of independent claims 10, 20, 25 and 36 and, therefore, are patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding these independent claims.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of each of claims 12, 22 and 40 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that these rejections be withdrawn and that these claims be allowed.

Claim 32 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Bates et al. and Horvitz et al. Applicant submits that this claim is dependant on independent claim 30 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 32 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Claim 33 has been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Duperrouzel et al. in view of Horvitz et al. and further in view of Ishikawa. Applicant submits that this claim is dependant on independent claim 30 and, therefore, is patentable at least for the same reasons noted previously regarding this independent claim.

Accordingly, Applicant submits that none of the cited references, taken alone or in any proper combination, disclose, suggest or render obvious the limitations in the combination of claim 33 of the present application. Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection be withdrawn and that this claim be allowed.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicant submits that claims 1, 2, 4, 5, 7, 9 – 13, 15 – 18, 20 – 23, 25, 27 and 29 – 40 are now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, early allowance of such claims is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions about the present Amendment or anticipates finally rejecting any claim of the present application, a telephone interview is requested.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 09-0461.

Respectfully submitted,

Patrick R. Guido
(Applicant)

Date: June 24, 2008
By: 
Frederick D. Bailey
Registration No. 42,282
Moore & Van Allen, PLLC
430 Davis Drive
Suite 500
Morrisville, N.C. 27560
Telephone: (919) 286-8000
Facsimile: (919) 286-8199